arXiv:1608.06472v4 [cs.CR] 3 Sep 2016

Multivariate Cryptography with Mappings of Discrete Logarithms and Polynomials

Duggirala Meher Krishna* Duggirala Ravi†

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Preliminary Discussion 2
1.2 Notation 3
1.3 Polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}_n$ 3
1.4 Modular Exponentiation over $\mathbb{Z}_n$ 4
1.5 Modular Exponentiation over $\mathbb{F}$ 5

2 Main Results **6**
2.1 Parametric Injective Mappings 6
2.1.1 Parametrization Methods 7
2.1.2 Partition of Unity of $\mathbb{F}$ 7
2.1.3 Partition of Unity of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^l}$ 8
2.1.4 Multivariate Polynomials that Evaluate to only Invertible Elements 8
2.2 Univariate Bijective Mappings without Parameters 9
2.2.1 Single Variable Permutation Polynomials without Hashing 9
2.2.2 Hybrid Single Variable Permutation Polynomials with Hashing 12
2.3 Multivariate Injective Mappings without Parameters 13
2.3.1 Multivariate Injective Mappings from G^m into E^m . . 13
2.3.2 Hybrid Multivariate Injective Mappings with Hashing 13

*Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering (ECE), Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering (Autonomous), Madhurawada, VISAKHAPATNAM – 530 048, Andhra Pradesh, India. E-mail : duggiralameherkrishna@gmail.com

†Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering (Autonomous), Madhurawada, VISAKHAPATNAM – 530 048, Andhra Pradesh, India. E-mail : ravi@gvpce.ac.in; duggirala.ravi@yahoo.com; duggirala.ravi@rediffmail.com; and drdravi2000@yahoo.com

3 Public Key Cryptography and Digital Signature 14
3.1 Hashing Keys 15
3.2 Public Key Cryptography (PKC) 15
3.3 Digital Signature (DS) 16

4 Complexity Analysis of Computing Nonparametric Inverses of Parametric Multivariate Polynomial Mappings 18
4.1 Constraint Satisfaction Problem 19
4.2 Quantifier Elimination Problem 21
4.3 Parametric Multivariate Polynomial Mappings 22
4.4 Simultaneous Multivariate Polynomial Equations over $\mathbb{F}$ . . . 24

5 Conclusions 26
5.1 Security Analysis 26
5.2 Summary 27

Abstract

In this paper, algorithms for multivariate public key cryptography and digital signature are described. Plain messages and encrypted messages are arrays, consisting of elements from a fixed finite ring or field. The encryption and decryption algorithms are based on multivariate mappings. The security of the private key depends on the difficulty of solving a system of parametric simultaneous multivariate equations involving polynomial or exponential mappings. The method is a general purpose utility for most data encryption, digital certificate or digital signature applications.

1 Introduction

1.1 Preliminary Discussion

The role of cryptographic algorithms is to provide information security [9, 28, 42, 44, 45, 46]. In general, proper data encryption and authentication mechanisms with access control are the preferred means for a trusted secure system [44, 45]. The most popular public key cryptosystems are the RSA [41], NTRU Encrypt algorithm [21, 22, 23, 24], elliptic curve cryptography (ECC) [27, 37, 43, 48], the algorithms based on diophantine equations and discrete logarithms [33, 15], and those based on multivariate quadratic polynomials [6, 29]. The RSA, the NTRU and the ECC are assumed to be secure algorithms unless there are new breakthroughs in integer factoring (for RSA), or in lattice reduction (for NTRU), or in elliptic curve discrete logarithm techniques (for ECC) [11, 19].

In this paper, algorithms for public key cryptography as well as digital signature based on multivariate mappings are described, with plain and encrypted message arrays consisting of elements from a fixed commutative

and finite ring or field. The keys can be built up starting from independently chosen small degree polynomial or easy exponential mappings, resulting in fast key generation and facilitating easy changes of keys as often as required. The security depends on the difficulty of solving parametric simultaneous multivariate equations involving polynomial or exponential mappings [8, 10, 16, 17, 35, 36, 12, 14] in the case of straightforward attacks, and on the difficulty of finding the private keys in the case of key recovery attacks.

1.2 Notation

In the sequel, let $\mathbb{Z}$ be the set of integers, and let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of positive integers. For a positive integer $\mathfrak{n} \geq 2$, let $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ be the ring of integers with addition and multiplication $\bmod \mathfrak{n}$, and $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^*$ be the commutative group of invertible elements in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, with respect to multiplication operation in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field, consisting of $\mathfrak{p}^n$ elements for some positive integer n and prime number $\mathfrak{p}$, and let $\mathbb{F}^*$ be the multiplicative group of nonzero elements in $\mathbb{F}$. Let G be a finite cyclic group of order $\mathfrak{n} \geq 2$. Let E be either $\mathbb{F}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ or G. If $\mathsf{E} = \mathsf{G}$, where G is equipped with only the group operation, then G is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, where the group operation in G is identified with the addition operation of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. The addition operation of $\mathbb{Z}$ is a primary operation, and the multiplication operation, that can be treated as a secondary operation [34] over the additive group $\mathbb{Z}$, is defined uniquely such that the distribution laws hold true, with 1 as the multiplicative identity, rendering $\mathbb{Z}$ as the commutative ring, and the same holds for $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. Let $\mathsf{E}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, be the algebra of multivariate polynomials in m formal variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ with coefficients in E. Now, if $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, for a finite field $\mathbb{F}$, then the group operation in G coincides with the multiplication operation in $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathsf{G}[x_1, \ldots, x_m] = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$. If $m = 1$, then $\mathsf{E}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ is denoted by $\mathsf{E}[x]$, with $x = x_1$. A variable with its name expressed in bold face assumes values from a product space, which is a product of finitely many copies of the same set, and each component of the variable, expressed in the corresponding case without boldness and a positive integer subscript, assumes values from the constituent component space, succinctly as, for example, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathsf{E}^m$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

1.3 Polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$

Let $\mathfrak{n} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}$, where r and l_i are positive integers, and $\mathfrak{p}_i$ are distinct prime numbers, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{p}_i^{-l_i} \mathfrak{n} = \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_j^{l_j}$, and let $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $m_i \mathfrak{q}_i \equiv 1 \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then, $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}} = \oplus_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}}$.

Now, a polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}[x]$ can be expressed as $\sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i f_i(x)$, for some unique polynomials $f_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}}[x]$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. For some

$x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, if $\mathtt{p}_i \mid f(x)$, then $\mathsf{gcd}(f(x) \bmod \mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}, \mathtt{p}_i) = \mathsf{gcd}(f_i(x), \mathtt{p}_i) = \mathtt{p}_i \neq 1$. Thus, $\mathsf{gcd}(f(x), \mathtt{n}) = 1$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}$, if and only if $\mathsf{gcd}(f_i(x), \mathtt{p}_i) = 1$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}$, for every index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$. Similarly, f is a surjective (hence bijective) mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}$ onto $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}$, if and only if f_i is a surjective (hence bijective) mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}$ onto $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}$, or equivalently, $f_i(x) \bmod \mathtt{p}_i$ is a bijective mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i}$ into itself and, when $l_i \geq 2$, $f_i'(x) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}_i$, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}$, where f_i' is the formal algebraic derivative of f_i, for every index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$ [31]. Now, if $g(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x]$, where $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathtt{q}_i g_i(x)$, for some $g_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}[x]$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$, then $f(x)g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathtt{q}_i f_i(x) g_i(x)$. Thus, (A) $f(x)$ is a unit in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x]$, if and only if $f_i(x)$ is a unit, *i.e.*, $f_i(x) \bmod \mathtt{p}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i}^*$, for every index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, (B) $f(x)$ is reducible in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x]$, if and only if $f_i(x)$ is reducible in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}[x]$, for some index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, and (C) $f(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x]$, if and only if $f_i(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}[x]$, or equivalently, $f_i(x) \bmod \mathtt{p}_i$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i}[x]$, for every index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$. Thus, for any positive integer k, $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$ can be expressed as $\oplus_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathtt{q}_i \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}}[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$.

1.4 Modular Exponentiation over $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}$

The modular exponentiation operation is extensively studied in connection with the RSA cryptosystem [9, 28, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46]. In this section, the modular exponentiation is extended to the situation, wherein the exponents are functions. The security of the RSA system depends on the difficulty of factorization of a positive integer into its prime factors. However, simplification of computations as well as porting of variables from base level to exponentiation level by a homomorphism requires availability of prime factors in advance for both encryption and decryption, while working with multivariate mappings involving functions as exponents. In the sequel, let φ be the Euler phi function [9, 28, 42, 46]. Let $\mathtt{n} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $l_i \in \mathbb{N} \backslash \{1\}$ and $\mathtt{p}_i$ are distinct prime numbers, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m])$ be the smallest set of expressions, closed with respect to addition and multiplication, and containing expressions of the form $a(x_1, \ldots, x_m)^{b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)}$, where $a(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, and either

1. as a formal expression, $b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ does not depend on $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and evaluates to any fixed positive integer, or

2. $a(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ evaluates to elements in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}^*$, for all values of $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ in some domain of interest, which is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{n}}^m$, and $b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$

is of the form $c(h(x_1), \ldots, h(x_m))$, for some expression $c(z_1, \ldots, z_m) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{n})}; [z_1, \ldots, z_m])$ and ring homomorphism h from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ into $\mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{n})}$.

The condition in (1) above implies that $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \subseteq \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m])$. Thus, the integers in $\mathbb{Z}$ and those in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, for various modulus positive integers $\mathfrak{n} \geq 2$, need to be distinguished clearly as separate elements. The expressions in $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m])$ are turned into mappings, by identifying appropriate domains of values and interpretation for variables and operations in the respective domains [12, 14, 34, 35]. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^m$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\}$, such that $s \mid \mathfrak{n}$, let $\mathbf{x} \bmod s = (x_1 \bmod s, \ldots, x_m \bmod s)$. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ be such that $f(\mathbf{x})$ evaluates to elements in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^*$, for $\mathbf{x} \in X$, for some $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^m$, and let $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$, be such that $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i f_i(\mathbf{x} \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})$. Now, for $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the following holds: $(f(\mathbf{x}))^k = (f(\mathbf{x}))^{k \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{n})} = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i (f_i(\mathbf{x} \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}))^{k \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{n})}$ $= \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i (f_i(\mathbf{x} \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}))^{k \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})}$. Let $g(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}})}[y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ and $g_i(\mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})}[z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ be such that the following holds: $g_i(\mathbf{y} \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})) = g(\mathbf{y}) \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Thus, $f^{g(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i f_i^{g(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i f_i^{g_i(\mathbf{y} \bmod \varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}))}(\mathbf{x} \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})$, for independent vectors $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{n})}^n$. Now, $\varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}) = (\mathfrak{p}_i - 1)\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i - 1}$, where $l_i \geq 2$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Let $w_i = (\mathfrak{p}_i - 1)^{-1} \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i - 1}$, and let $h_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})}$ be the map defined by $h_i(x) = (\mathfrak{p}_i - 1)(w_i x \bmod \mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i - 1})$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then, h_i is a ring homomorphism, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Now, let $h(\sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i z_i) = (h_1(z_1), \ldots, h_r(z_r))$, for $z_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then, the map h is a ring homomorphism from the ring $\oplus_{i=1}^{r} m_i \mathfrak{q}_i \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i}}$ into the ring of direct product $\prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(\mathfrak{p}_i^{l_i})}$. If the base level and exponentiation level interpretation maps are $\mathcal{I}_{\text{base}}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\text{exponent}}$, respectively, then $\mathcal{I}_{\text{exponent}}$ can be chosen to be $h \circ \mathcal{I}_{\text{base}}$, applied from right to left in the written order, preserving the respective ring operations in the base level and exponentiation level subexpressions. If $l_i = 1$, for some index i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, then exponentiation along ith component can be carried by interpreting $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ to be a finite field, and porting values of base level expressions to exponentiation level expressions by discrete logarithm mapping, as discussed in section 1.5.

1.5 Modular Exponentiation over $\mathbb{F}$

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field containing $\mathfrak{p}^n$ elements and $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{p}^n - 1$, for some prime number $\mathfrak{p}$ and positive integer n. Let $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m])$ be the smallest set of expressions, closed with respect to addition and multiplication, and containing expressions of the form $a(x_1, \ldots, x_m)^{b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)}$, where

$a(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, and either

1. as a formal expression, $b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ does not depend on $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and evaluates to any fixed positive integer, or

2. $a(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ evaluates to elements in $\mathbb{F}^*$, for all values of $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ in some domain of interest, which is a subset of G^m, where $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, and $b(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is of the form $c(h(x_1), \ldots, h(x_m))$, for some expression $c(z_1, \ldots, z_m) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}; [z_1, \ldots, z_m])$ and group isomorphism h from G into $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

The condition in (1) above implies that $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_m] \subseteq \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m])$. For a primitive element $a \in \mathbb{F}^*$, let $\log_a : \mathbb{F}^* \to \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ be the discrete logarithm function defined by $\log_a(g) = x$, exactly when $a^x = g$, for $g \in \mathbb{F}^*$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. Thus, the group homomorphism h can be taken to be $\log_a$. If the base level and exponentiation level interpretation maps are $\mathcal{I}_{\text{base}}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\text{exponent}}$, respectively, then $\mathcal{I}_{\text{exponent}}$ can be chosen to be $\log_a \circ \mathcal{I}_{\text{base}}$, applied from right to left in the written order. For porting a subexpression involving addition operation in $\mathbb{F}$, such as, for example, $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$, where $f(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{G}^m$, where $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, occurring in a base level expression to an exponentiation level, the base level subexpression is replaced by a supplementary variable z, which is ported to first exponentiation level by the discrete logarithm mapping. In the subsequent levels of exponentiation, the interpretation is performed by applying ring homomorphisms, as discussed in section 1.4.

2 Main Results

2.1 Parametric Injective Mappings

Let E be either $\mathbb{F}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$. Let $\mathsf{G} \subseteq \mathsf{E}$ be the domain of interpretation for the variables occurring in the mappings. For $l \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. a parametric multivariate injective mapping $\eta(z_1, \ldots, z_l; (x_1, \ldots, x_m))$ from G^m into E^m is a multivariate injective mapping, which is an expression from either $\mathsf{E}[x_1, \ldots, x_m, z_1, \ldots, z_l]$ or $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathsf{E}; [x_1, \ldots, x_m, z_1, \ldots, z_l])$ with interpretation conventions as discussed in sections 1.4-1.5, as appropriate, for $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathsf{G}^m$ and $(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathsf{E}^l$, and its parametric inverse $\eta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_l; (y_1, \ldots, y_m))$ is such that, for every fixed $(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathcal{Z}$, the following holds: if $\eta(z_1, \ldots, z_l; (x_1, \ldots, x_m)) = (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, then $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \eta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_l; (y_1, \ldots, y_m))$, for every $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathsf{G}^m$ and $(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in \mathsf{E}^m$. For example, let $\mathfrak{n}$ be the set cardinality of $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, $a \in \mathbb{F}^*$ be a fixed primitive element, which is made known in the public key, and $\eta(z_1, \ldots, z_l; x) = f(z_1, \ldots, z_l)x^{g(\log_a(z_1), \ldots, \log_a(z_l))}$, where $f(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z_1, \ldots, z_l])$ and $g(t_1, \ldots, t_l) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}; [t_1, \ldots, t_l])$ are such that $f(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \neq 0$, for $z_1, \ldots, z_l \in \mathbb{F}^*$, and $\gcd(g(t_1, \ldots, t_l), \mathfrak{n}) = 1$,

for $t_1, \ldots, t_l \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Then, $\eta(z_1, \ldots, z_l; x)$ is a parametric bijective mapping from $\mathbb{F}^*$ into $\mathbb{F}^*$, with $z_1, \ldots, z_l \in \mathbb{F}^*$ as parameters, and $\eta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_l; x) = [\ [f(z_1, \ldots, z_l)]^{-1} x\ ]^{[\ [g(\log_a(z_1), \ldots, \log_a(z_l))]^{-1} \bmod n\ ]}$.

2.1.1 Parametrization Methods

Let, for some positive integers k, l and m, $g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, be a partition of unity of E^l, *i.e.*, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) = 1$ and $g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \cdot g_j(z_1, \ldots, z_l) = 0$, $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, for every $(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathsf{E}^l$. Let $\zeta_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l; \mathbf{x})$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, be parametric multivariate injective mappings from G^m into E^m, that may or may not depend on the parameters $z_1, \ldots, z_l$. Let $\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$ and $\chi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$ be expressions such that $\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$ evaluates to invertible elements in E, for all $(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathsf{E}^l$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then, the expression $\eta(z_1, \ldots, z_l; \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \cdot \phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \cdot [\zeta_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l; \mathbf{x}) + \chi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)]$ is a parametric multivariate injective mapping, with its parametric inverse $\eta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_l; \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \cdot \zeta_i^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_l; \mathbf{y}_i)$, where $y_{i,j} = [\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)]^{-1} \cdot x_j - \chi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, and $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i,1}, \ldots, y_{i,m})$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. For public key cryptography hashing keys, it is possible to construct parametric multivariate injective mappings in section 3.1 with any expressions $\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$ that evaluate to only invertible elements, $1 \leq i \leq k$, having only a small number of terms. For digital signature hashing keys in section 3.1, however, the multivariate expressions $\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \neq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, must be such that both $\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$ and its multiplicative inverse $[\phi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l)]^{-1}$ are expressible with only a small number of terms each.

2.1.2 Partition of Unity of $\mathbb{F}$

Let $f(z) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z])$, which is called a discriminating function, and let K_f be the codomain of f, *i.e.*, $K_f = \{f(x) : x \in \mathbb{F}\} = \{a_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, for some positive integer k. Let $\ell_i(x) = \left[\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{k} (a_i - a_j)\right]^{-1} \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{k} (f(x) - a_j)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then, $\ell_i(x) = 1$, for $x \in E_i = \{z \in \mathbb{F} : f(z) - a_i = 0\}$, and $\ell_i(x) = 0$, for $x \in \mathbb{F} \backslash E_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, $\{E_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ is a partition of $\mathbb{F}$, and $\ell_i(x)$ is the characteristic function of the equivalence class E_i, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Now, the set $\{g_i(z_1, \ldots, z_l) = \ell_i(h(z_1, \ldots, z_l)) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, where $h(z_1, \ldots, z_l) \in \mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z_1, \ldots, z_l])$, is a partition of unity of $\mathbb{F}^l$.

Examples. (A) Let the vector space dimension of $\mathbb{F}$ be n as an extension field of $\mathbb{Z}_p$, and let $f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z^{p^{i-1}}$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, be a noninvertible linear operator from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$, with $\mathbb{Z}_p$ as the field. For every linear operator T from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_p$ as the field, there exist scalars $c_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $Tz = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i z^{p^{i-1}}$ [32]. Now, each equivalence class is an affine vector subspace of the form $\{y + x : f(x) = 0,\ x \in \mathbb{F}\}$, for some $y \in \mathbb{F}$. Thus, if r is the rank

of f as linear operator from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ as the field, then the nullity of f is $n-r$, each equivalence class has $\mathtt{p}^{n-r}$ elements, and there are $k=\mathtt{p}^r$ equivalence classes. For the number of equivalence classes to be small, the rank r of f must be small, such as $r=1$ or $r=2$. (B) Let $f(z)=z^r$, where r is a large positive integer dividing $\mathtt{p}^n-1$. Now, the equivalence classes are $\{0\}$ and the cosets of the congruence relation $x\sim y$ if and only if $(x^{-1}y)^r=1$, for $x,\,y\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$. Since $K_{_f}=\{0\}\cup\{z^r\,:\,z\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}\}$, there are $k=1+(\mathtt{p}^n-1)/r$ equivalence classes.

2.1.3 Partition of Unity of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$

Let $s\in\mathbb{N}$ be a divisor of $(\mathtt{p}-1)$ and $k=1+\frac{(\mathtt{p}-1)}{s}$. Now, $\mathtt{p}^{l-1}\geq l$, for any $l\in\mathbb{N}$ and prime number $\mathtt{p}$. Let $h(x)=x^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}$, for $x\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$. Then, $(h(x))^{k-1}=1$, for $x\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$, and $h(x)=0$, for $x\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}\backslash\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$. Thus, the set $\{x^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}\,:\,x\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}\}$ contains k distinct elements. Let $x,\,y\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$ be such that $h(x)\neq h(y)$. If $h(x)=0$ or $h(y)=0$, then $(h(y)-h(x))\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$. Now, let $x,\,y\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$. If $(x^{-1}y)^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}=1+b\mathtt{p}^t$, for some $b\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$ and $t\in\mathbb{N}$, then, since $1+b\mathtt{p}^t\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\frac{(k-1)!}{i!(k-i-1)!}b^{i-1}\mathtt{p}^{(i-1)t}=(1+b\mathtt{p}^t)^{k-1}=((x^{-1}y)^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}})^{k-1}=1\bmod\mathtt{p}^l$, it follows that either $t\geq l$ or $(k-1)+\sum_{i=2}^{k-1}\frac{(k-1)!}{i!(k-i-1)!}b^{i-1}\mathtt{p}^{(i-1)t}=0\bmod\mathtt{p}^{l-t}$. However, since $k=1+\frac{\mathtt{p}-1}{s}$, and therefore, $1\leq k-1\leq\mathtt{p}-1$, it follows that $(k-1)+\sum_{i=2}^{k-1}\frac{(k-1)!}{i!(k-i-1)!}b^{i-1}\mathtt{p}^{(i-1)t}=k-1\bmod\mathtt{p}$. Thus, if $x,\,y\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$ and $h(x)\neq h(y)$, then $(x^{-1}y)^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}-1\neq 0\bmod\mathtt{p}$, and hence if $x,\,y\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$ and $h(x)\neq h(y)$, then $(h(y)-h(x))\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$. If $a_{_j}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$, $1\leq j\leq k$, are such that $\{x^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}\,:\,x\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}\}=\{a_{_j}\,:\,1\leq j\leq k\}$, then $(a_{_i}-a_{_j})\in\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$, for $i\neq j$, $1\leq i,\,j\leq k$, and the Lagrange interpolation polynomials $g_{_j}(x)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}[x]$ can be obtained for the equivalence classes $E_{_j}=\{x^{s\mathtt{p}^{l-1}}=a_{_j}\,:\,x\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}\}$. Thus, corresponding to every homomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}}$ into $\mathbb{Z}^{\star}_{\mathtt{p}}$, a partition of unity of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$ can be obtained.

2.1.4 Multivariate Polynomials that Evaluate to only Invertible Elements

Let $f(z)\in\mathbb{F}[z]$ be a polynomial which is not surjective as a mapping from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$. Then, there exists an element $c\in\mathbb{F}$, such that $f(z)-c\neq 0$, for every $z\in\mathbb{F}$. For $a\in\mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$ and $g(z_{_1},\,\ldots,\,z_{_l})\in\mathbb{F}[z_{_1},\,\ldots,\,z_{_l}]$, $a(f(g(z_{_1},\,\ldots,\,z_{_l}))-c)\neq 0$, for every $(z_{_1},\,\ldots,\,z_{_l})\in\mathbb{F}^l$.

Examples. (A) Let $f(z)$ be a product of irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{F}[z]$ of degree 2 or more each. Then, c can be chosen to be 0. (B) Let the vector space dimension of $\mathbb{F}$ be n as an extension field of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, and let $f(z)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_{_i}z^{\mathtt{p}^{i-1}}$, where $a_{_i}\in\mathbb{F}$, $1\leq i\leq n$, be a noninvertible linear operator from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$, with $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ as the field. Then, for any basis $\{\alpha_{_1},\,\ldots,\,\alpha_{_n}\}$ for $\mathbb{F}$, with $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ as the field, there exists an

index j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z^{\mathtt{p}^{i-1}} - \alpha_j \neq 0$, for every $z \in \mathbb{F}$, and c can be taken to be α_j. (C) Let $r \geq 2$ be a positive integer divisor of $\mathtt{p}^n - 1$, and let $f(z) = z^r$. Then, there exists an element $c \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$, such that $c^{(\mathtt{p}^n-1)/r} \neq 1$. Now, since $c^{(\mathtt{p}^n-1)/r} \neq 0$ and $c^{(\mathtt{p}^n-1)/r} \neq 1$, it follows that $f(z) - c \neq 0$, for every $z \in \mathbb{F}$.

If $f(z) \in \mathbb{F}[z]$ is such that $f(z) \neq 0$, for every $z \in \mathbb{F}$, then $[f(z)]^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^{-1} \ell_i(z)$, where $\{a_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\} = \{f(z) : z \in \mathbb{F}\}$, and $\ell_i(z) = \left[\prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{k} (a_i - a_j)\right]^{-1} \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{k} (f(z) - a_j)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, for digital signature hashing keys in section 3.1, the appropriate choices for a nonvanishing function $f(z) \neq 0$, $z \in \mathbb{F}$, are those similar to the choice of discriminating functions discussed at the end of section 2.1.2.

Let $\mathfrak{n} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathtt{p}_i^{l_i}$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $l_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathtt{p}_i$ are distinct prime numbers, for $1 \leq i \leq r$, and $f(z) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}[z]$. From section 1.3, it can be recalled that, $f(z) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^*$, for $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, if and only if for every i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, $f(z) \bmod \mathtt{p}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}_i}^*$, for $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

2.2 Univariate Bijective Mappings without Parameters

2.2.1 Single Variable Permutation Polynomials without Hashing

Examples in $\mathbb{F}[x]$ Bijective mappings in $\mathbb{F}[x]$, also called permutation polynomials, are extensively studied as Dickson polynomials [13] in the literature. A comprehensive survey on Dickson polynomials can be found in [1, 18, 31, 38, 39]. Some recent results are presented in [2, 3, 4]. If $f(z) \in \mathbb{F}[z]$ is a permutation polynomial, then, for every $a \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{F}$ and nonnegative integer i, the polynomial $af(z^{\mathtt{p}^i}) - b$ is a permutation polynomial. Some easy examples are described in the following.

Examples. (A) Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite dimensional extension field of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ of vector space dimension n. Any polynomial $f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i z^{\mathtt{p}^{i-1}}$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, that is an invertible linear operator from $\mathbb{F}$ onto $\mathbb{F}$, with $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ as the field, is a permutation polynomial. (B) Let r be a positive integer divisor of n, and $f(z) = z^{\mathtt{p}^r} - az$, where $a^{(\sum_{i=1}^{n/r} \mathtt{p}^{(i-1)r})} \neq 1$. Then, for every $z \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\{0\}$, $z^{(\mathtt{p}^r-1)} - a \neq 0$, since $z^{\mathtt{p}^n-1} = z^{(\mathtt{p}^r-1)\sum_{i=1}^{n/r} \mathtt{p}^{(i-1)r}} = 1$, and therefore, the null space of $f(z)$, as a linear operator from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ as the field, is $\{0\}$. Thus, $f(z)$ is a permutation polynomial. (C) Let r be a positive integer relatively prime to $(\mathtt{p}^n - 1)$. Then, the polynomial $f(z) = z^r$ is a permutation polynomial.

Examples in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}[x]$ Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathtt{p}$ be a prime number. For any positive integer n, Dickson polynomials that are permutation polynomials, having nonvanishing derivatives over the finite field containing $\mathtt{p}^n$ elements, are found in [1, 2, 3, 4, 18, 31, 38, 39]. For a small prime number $\mathtt{p}$, two methods for construction of permutation polynomials $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}[x]$, such that $f'(x) \neq 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, are described below. As a set, $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ is taken to be the set of integers

i, where $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$. For $\mathtt{p}=2$, the only permutation polynomials are $f(x)=x$ and $f(x)=x-1$, and in both cases, $f'(x)=1 \bmod 2$. Now, let $\mathtt{p} \geq 3$ be a small prime number, such that the computations below are not difficult for implementation. Let $\ell_i(x) = \big[\prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (i-j)\big]^{-1} \cdot \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (x-j) = -\prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (x-j)$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$. Now, $\ell_i'(x) = -\sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} \prod_{\substack{k=0 \\ k \notin \{i,\, j\}}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (x-k)$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, which implies that $\ell_i'(j) = -\prod_{\substack{k=0 \\ k \notin \{i,\, j\}}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (j-k) = (j-i)^{-1}$, for $j \neq i$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, and $\ell_i'(i) = -\sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} \prod_{\substack{k=0 \\ k \notin \{i,\, j\}}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (i-k) = \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \neq i}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (i-j)^{-1} = 0$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, since $\mathtt{p} \geq 3$. For a fixed permutation sequence $\{a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}} : 0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1\}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, either of the two procedures described below constructs a permutation polynomial in $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}[x]$, such that $f(i)=a_i$ and $f'(i) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$.

Method 1 Let $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} a_i \ell_i(x) = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{p}-1} b_i x^i$, for some $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, for $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, and let $g(x) = c_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i x^{i-1}$, for some $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, for $1 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, be such that $g(x) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$. Let $\rho_i = i^{-1} c_i$ and $\sigma_i = b_i - \rho_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$. Let $f(x) = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (\rho_i x^i + \sigma_i x^{i\mathtt{p}})$. Then, $f(x) \equiv b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{p}-1} b_i x^i \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, and $f'(x) \equiv \rho_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i \rho_i x^{i-1} \equiv c_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i x^{i-1} \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, satisfying the stated requirement.

Method 2 Let $b_i, c_i, \sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, for $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, be such that $b_0 = a_0$ and $b_j + c_j = a_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, and let $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (b_i + x^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i - \sigma i) \ell_i(x) + \sigma x^{\mathtt{p}}$. It can be immediately verified that $f(i) \equiv a_i \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, and $f'(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (b_i + x^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i - \sigma i) \ell_i'(x) + \mathtt{p}\sigma x^{\mathtt{p}-1} + (\mathtt{p}-1) x^{\mathtt{p}-2} \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i \ell_i(x)$, where $\mathtt{p} \geq 3$. Thus, the parameters c_0, σ, b_j and c_j, for $1 \leq j \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, need to be chosen such that $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$. Now, $f(x) + \sigma x = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (b_i + c_i x^{\mathtt{p}-1}) \ell_i(x) + \sigma x^{\mathtt{p}}$, and $f'(x) + \sigma = \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (b_i + c_i x^{\mathtt{p}-1}) \ell_i'(x) + \mathtt{p}\sigma x^{\mathtt{p}-1} + (\mathtt{p}-1) x^{\mathtt{p}-2} \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} c_i \ell_i(x)$. Thus, $f'(0) + \sigma \equiv -\sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{-1} b_i \bmod \mathtt{p}$ and $f'(j) + \sigma \equiv \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} a_i (j-i)^{-1} + c_0 j^{-1} - j^{-1} c_j \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $1 \leq j \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, which implies that every element in the sequence of numbers $(f'(i) + \sigma) \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, is independent of the choice of σ, and the condition that $f'(i) \not\equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1$, is equivalent to that $\sigma \notin \{(f'(i) + \sigma) \bmod \mathtt{p} : 0 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}-1\}$. For $\mathtt{p} \geq 3$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} 1 \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, and since $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ is the splitting field of the polynomial $x^{\mathtt{p}} - x = \prod_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} (x-i)$, the elementary symmetric polynomials $s_r(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$, which are homogeneous of degree r in n variables, for the particular instances of parameters $n = \mathtt{p}$ and $t_i = i-1$, for $1 \leq i \leq \mathtt{p}$, as defined in [30], are all congruent to $0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $1 \leq r \leq \mathtt{p}-2$. Thus, $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^r \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} 1 \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, for $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq r \leq \mathtt{p}-2$ and $\mathtt{p} \geq 3$, which implies that for a nonzero polynomial $g(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}[x]$ of degree at most $\mathtt{p}-2$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} g(i) \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$. Now, $\mathtt{p} \sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{\mathtt{p}-1} \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, and, for $l \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$\mathtt{p}+1 \le l \le 2\mathtt{p}-2$, $l\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{l-1} \equiv l\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{l-1-(\mathtt{p}-1)} \equiv l\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{l-\mathtt{p}} \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$, since $1 \le l-\mathtt{p} \le \mathtt{p}-2$. Thus, for a nonzero polynomial $h(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}[x]$ of degree at most $2\mathtt{p}-2$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} h'(i) \equiv 0 \bmod \mathtt{p}$. The coefficients c_i, for $0 \le i \le \mathtt{p}-1$, must be so chosen that the additional requirement that $f(x)+\sigma x$ is a polynomial of degree at most $2\mathtt{p}-2$ can also be fulfilled. Now, let $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$, for $0 \le i \le \mathtt{p}-1$, be chosen, such that the cardinality of the set $\Lambda = \{\lambda_i : 0 \le i \le \mathtt{p}-1\}$ is at most $\mathtt{p}-1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathtt{p}-1} \lambda_i = 0$. Then, $c_j - c_0$ are found from the condition $f'(j)+\sigma = \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i\neq j}}^{\mathtt{p}-1} a_i(j-i)^{-1} - j^{-1}(c_j - c_0) = \lambda_j$, for $1 \le j \le \mathtt{p}-1$, and hence, $f'(0)+\sigma = -\sum_{i=1}^{\mathtt{p}-1} i^{-1}b_i = \lambda_0$, for all choices of c_0. Now, let σ be chosen from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}\backslash\Lambda$, where the latter set is nonempty, since the cardinality of Λ is at most $\mathtt{p}-1$, by the choices of λ_i, for $0 \le i \le \mathtt{p}-1$. Finally, c_0 is chosen, and b_j and c_j, for $1 \le j \le \mathtt{p}-1$, are determined by the aforementioned conditions.

For a small prime number $\mathtt{p}$, positive integers l and r, such that $l \ge 2$ and $1 \le r \le l$, a bijective mapping $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}[x]$ and $y \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$, the following procedure computes $x_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^r}$, such that $f_r(x_r) \equiv y \bmod \mathtt{p}^r$, assuming $x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}}$ is known, such that $f_1(x_1) \equiv y \bmod \mathtt{p}$, where $f_r(x) = f(x) \bmod \mathtt{p}^r$, applying the $\bmod \mathtt{p}^r$ operation only to the coefficients. Let $2 \le r \le l$, where $l \ge 2$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil \le s \le r-1$ and $y_r = y \bmod \mathtt{p}^r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^r}$, and $x_s = f_s^{-1}(y_r \bmod \mathtt{p}^s) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^s}$ has been computed. Let $\hat{x}_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^r}$ be such that $\hat{x}_s \equiv x_s \bmod \mathtt{p}^s$. Since $f_r(\hat{x}_s) \equiv y_r \bmod \mathtt{p}^s$, it follows that $f_r(\hat{x}_s) = y_r + \mathtt{p}^s g_{r,s}(\hat{x}_s, y_r)$, for some mapping $g_{r,s}(\hat{x}_s, y_r)$, and therefore, $f_r(\hat{x}_s + [f_r'(\hat{x}_s)]^{-1} \cdot [y_r - f_r(\hat{x}_s)]) \equiv f_r(\hat{x}_s) + f_r'(\hat{x}_s) \cdot [f_r'(\hat{x}_s)]^{-1} \cdot [y_r - f_r(\hat{x}_s)] \equiv f_r(\hat{x}_s) + [y_r - f_r(\hat{x}_s)] \equiv y_r \bmod \mathtt{p}^r$. Thus, $f_r^{-1}(y_r) = \hat{x}_s + [f_r'(\hat{x}_s)]^{-1} \cdot [y_r - f_r(\hat{x}_s)] \bmod \mathtt{p}^r$. If $r = l$, then the $f^{-1}(y)$ is just computed for $y \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathtt{p}^l}$, and the procedure can be stopped; otherwise, the previous steps are repeated, replacing the current value of r by $\min\{2r, l\}$.

Examples in $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z])$ Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field of $\mathtt{p}^n$ elements, for some prime number $\mathtt{p}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\mathtt{p}^n \ge 3$, and let $\mathfrak{n} = \mathtt{p}^n - 1$. Let $t \ge 2$ be a positive integer divisor of $\mathtt{p}^n - 1$, and let $H_t = \{x^t = 1 : x \in \mathbb{F}^*\}$. Let $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be such that $f(x) \bmod t$ yields a polynomial mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_t$ onto itself. It may be recalled that, as a set, $\mathbb{Z}_t$ is assumed to consist of integers i, where $0 \le i \le t-1$. Let a be a primitive element in $\mathbb{F}^*$. Now, for $x \in H_t$, since $x^t = 1$, applying $\log_a$ operation on both sides, $t \log_a x = 0 \bmod \mathfrak{n}$, which implies that $\log_a x$ is an integer multiple of $\frac{\mathfrak{n}}{t} = \frac{\mathtt{p}^n-1}{t}$, for every $x \in H_t$, and, since the cyclic subgroup generated by $a^{\frac{\mathfrak{n}}{t}}$ is H_t, it follows that $\log_a$ is a bijective mapping of H_t onto $\frac{\mathfrak{n}}{t} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}} = \{(\frac{i\mathfrak{n}}{t}) \bmod \mathfrak{n} : 0 \le i \le t-1\}$. Now, $f(\log_a(x)) \bmod \mathfrak{n}$, for $x \in H_t$, is an injective mapping, when restricted to H_t, which can be modified appropriately, by changing its constant term, if necessary, to obtain a polynomial g, which results in a bijective mapping from $\frac{\mathfrak{n}}{t} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ into itself, with respect to $\bmod \mathfrak{n}$ operation.

Then, the mapping $\eta(x) = a^{g(\log_a x)}$, for $x \in \mathbb{F}^*$, is such that its restriction to H_t is a bijective mapping from H_t onto itself.

2.2.2 Hybrid Single Variable Permutation Polynomials with Hashing

Method 1 Let $\ell_i(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$, be indicator functions of a partition $\{S_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ of $\mathbb{F}$. Let σ be a permutation on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, such that the set cardinalities of S_i and $S_{\sigma(i)}$ are equal, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let g_i be a mapping from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$, such that $g_i(S_i) = S_{\sigma(i)}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, g_i is one-to-one when restricted to S_i, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\eta(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ be a permutation polynomial, and $\chi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell_i(x)\eta(g_i(x))$. Then, $\chi(\mathbb{F}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \eta(g_i(S_i)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \eta(S_{\sigma(i)})$, and since $\{S_{\sigma(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ is a partition of $\mathbb{F}$, $\chi(x)$ is a surjective (hence bijective) polynomial from $\mathbb{F}$ onto $\mathbb{F}$. For inverting $\chi(x) = y$, for fixed $y \in \mathbb{F}$, let $\xi = \eta^{-1}(y)$. Now, there exists exactly one index i, where $1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $\xi \in S_{\sigma(i)} = g_i(S_i)$, and therefore, the unique element $x \in S_i$, such that $x = g_i^{-1}(\xi)$, satisfies $\chi(x) = y$. If f_i, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, are mappings from $\mathbb{F}$ into $\mathbb{F}$, such that $f_i(g_i(x)) = x$, for $x \in S_i$, then $\chi^{-1}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell_{\sigma(i)}(\eta^{-1}(y)) f_i(\eta^{-1}(y))$, for $y \in \mathbb{F}$. The case of bijective mappings in $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [x])$ can be similarly discussed. In the following examples, the corresponding examples in section 2.1.2 are revisited.

Examples. (A) Let $T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x^{\mathsf{p}^{i-1}}$, $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, be of rank t, where t is a small positive integer, such as $t \in \{1, 2\}$, as described in the first example in section 2.1.2 and let $V = \{x \in \mathbb{F} : T(x) = 0\}$. Then, there exist $k = \mathsf{p}^t$ representative elements $b_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $\{T(b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\} = T(\mathbb{F})$, and $S_i = V + b_i = \{x + b_i : x \in V\}$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $f_i(x) = c_{i,0} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i,j} x^{\mathsf{p}^{j-1}}$, where $c_{i,j}$, $x \in \mathbb{F}$, $0 \leq j \leq n$, be such that $V \subseteq f_i(V)$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, in the notation of the above discussion, the permutation polynomial $f_i(x) - b_i + b_{\sigma(i)}$ can be chosen to be $g_i(x)$, for $x \in \mathbb{F}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$. (B) Let $f(z) = z^t$, where t is a large positive integer dividing $\mathsf{p}^n - 1$, as described in the second example of section 2.1.2. Let $a_1 = 0$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}^*$, for $2 \leq i \leq k$, where $k = 1 + \frac{(\mathsf{p}^n - 1)}{t}$, be such that $\{f(a_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ is the codomain of f. Let σ be a permutation on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, such that $\sigma(1) = 1$, and let $H_t = \{y \in \mathbb{F} : y^t = 1\}$. Then, $S_i = a_i H_t = \{a_i v : v \in H_t\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $h_i(x)$, $x \in H_t$, be a bijective mapping discussed in the previous section, for $2 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, representing elements $c_i \in \mathbb{F}^*$ can be found easily, such that the mapping $g_i(x) = c_i h_i(a_i^{-1} x)$ satisfies $g_i(S_i) = S_{\sigma(i)}$, for $x \in S_i$ and $2 \leq i \leq k$.

Method 2 Let G be $\mathbb{F}^*$ or $\mathbb{F}$. Let f and h be mappings from G into itself, such that f is bijective and $h(f(x)) = h(x)$, for $x \in \mathsf{G}$. For instance, if (A) f is such that the cyclic group generated by it, as a subgroup of bijective mappings from G into G, with composition as the group operation, is of small order $\rho \geq 2$, (B) $g : \mathsf{G}^\rho \to \mathbb{F}$ is a symmetric function, which can be an expression in $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z_1, \ldots, z_\rho])$, symmetric in all the ρ variables,

(C) $f_0(x) = x$ and $f_i(x) = f(f_{i-1}(x))$, for $1 \leq i \leq \rho$, and (D) $h(x) = g(x, f_1(x), \ldots, f_{\rho-1}(x))$, for $x \in \mathsf{G}$, then $f_\rho(x) = x$ and $h(f(x)) = h(x)$, for $x \in \mathsf{G}$. Let σ be a permutation on $\{1, \ldots, \rho\}$, and $\{S_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, where $2 \leq k \leq \rho$, be a partition of $\mathbb{F}$, and let $\ell_i(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{F}$, be the indicator function of S_i, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let η be a bijective mapping from G into G, and $\zeta(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell_i(h(x))\eta(f_{\sigma(i)}(x))$, for $x \in \mathsf{G}$. Let $x, y \in \mathsf{G}$ be such that $\zeta(x) = \zeta(y)$, and let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ be such that $\ell_i(h(x)) = 1$ and $\ell_j(h(y)) = 1$. Then, $\eta(f_{\sigma(i)}(x)) = \eta(f_{\sigma(j)}(y))$, and since η is bijective, it follows that $f_{\sigma(i)}(x) = f_{\sigma(j)}(y)$. If $\sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j)$, then $x = f_{\sigma(j)-\sigma(i)}(y)$, and since $h(f(y)) = h(y)$, it follows that $h(x) = h(y)$, $\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)$ and $i = j$, and therefore, $x = y$. Thus, $\zeta^{-1}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell_i(h(\eta^{-1}(y)))f_{\sigma(i)}^{-1}(\eta^{-1}(y))$, for $y \in \mathsf{G}$.

2.3 Multivariate Injective Mappings without Parameters

2.3.1 Multivariate Injective Mappings from G^m into E^m

In this subsection, an iterative algorithm to construct a multivariate bijective mapping from G^m into E^m, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, is described. The algorithm utilizes parametric univariate bijective mappings discussed in the previous sections. In later subsections, some variations involving hashing are described.

1. Let $f_i : \mathsf{G} \to \mathsf{G}$ and $g_i : \mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{E}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, be bijective mappings.

2. Let $h_i(z_1, \ldots, z_{m-1}; x)$ be parametric injective mappings from G into E, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, $x \in \mathsf{G}$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_{m-1} \in \mathsf{E}$ being parameters, constructed, for example, as described in section 2.1.1.

3. Let $\zeta_i(\mathbf{x}) = h_i(\zeta_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, \zeta_m(\mathbf{x}), x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}\,;\, f_i(x_i))$ and $\eta_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_i(\zeta_i(\mathbf{x}))$, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathsf{G}^m$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $\eta(\mathbf{x}) = (\eta_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, \eta_m(\mathbf{x}))$.

For finding $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathsf{G}^m$, such that $\eta(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, for any fixed $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in \mathsf{E}^m$, let $\epsilon_i = g_i^{-1}(y_i)$ and $\delta_i = h_i^{-1}(\epsilon_{i+1}, \ldots, \epsilon_m, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}; \epsilon_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then, $x_i = f_i^{-1}(\delta_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Now, for $\mathsf{E} = \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, if g_i and h_i, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, are bijective mappings and parametric bijective mappings, respectively, from $\mathbb{F}^*$ into $\mathbb{F}^*$, then the above procedure can be applied to obtain multivariate bijective mappings from G^m into G^m. These mappings are required in appealing for a security that is immune to threats resulting from Gröbner basis analysis. It can be observed that one level of exponentiation suffices for the purpose.

2.3.2 Hybrid Multivariate Injective Mappings with Hashing

For Method 1 of the previous subsection, in the first example, in place of $T(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{F}$, $T(\alpha(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$, and in the second example, in place of

$f(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{F}$, $f(\beta(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$, are chosen, where $\alpha : \mathbb{F}^m \to \mathbb{F}$ is a non constant affine mapping in the first example, and $\beta(\mathbf{x}) = c\prod_{i=1}^{m} x_i^{s_i}$, for some nonnegative integers s_i, which, when positive, are relatively prime to $\mathtt{p}^n - 1$, and, when zero, for the corresponding subscript index i, the variable x_i does not occur in the product, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ is nonconstant, in the second example. Similarly, Method 2 hashing of the previous subsection can also be extended to multivariate mappings, replacing x with $\mathbf{x}$. For instance, if $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, a is a primitive element in $\mathbb{F}^*$ and $\mathfrak{n}$ is the set cardinality of $\mathbb{F}^*$, then $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be chosen to be $(a^{\phi_1(\log_a \mathbf{x})}, \ldots, a^{\phi_m(\log_a \mathbf{x})})$, where $\log_a \mathbf{x} = (\log_a x_1, \ldots, \log_a x_m)$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{y}) = (\phi_1(\mathbf{y}), \ldots, \phi_m(\mathbf{y}))$ is a bijective mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^m$ into itself, such that the cyclic subgroup generated by Φ, with respect to function composition operation, has a group order ρ, while g can be chosen to be an expression from $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F}; [z_{1,1}, \ldots, z_{m,1}, \ldots, z_{1,\rho}, \ldots, z_{m,\rho}])$, which is symmetric in the ρ vectors $(z_{1,i}, \ldots, z_{m,i})$, for $1 \leq i \leq \rho$. If $g = \pi^t$, for a symmetric mapping π obtained by taking product of terms as appropriate and a large positive integer divisor t of $\mathfrak{n}$, then since $t\Phi(\mathbf{y})$ is a bijective mapping from $t\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^m$ into itself, the order of the cyclic subgroup generated by $t\Phi(\mathbf{y})$, as a subgroup of the group of bijective mappings from $t\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}^m$ into itself, can be ensured to be only a small divisor of ρ, resulting in a more efficient method of hashing, even for a very large and perhaps unknown ρ. It can be observed that g can be chosen to depend only on a few scalar components from each vector, while maintaining symmetry in all its vector parameters, with each vector consisting of m scalars components, and that the main objective in Method 2 hashing is to produce a hashing function h that evaluates to the same same value, even if f is applied on its arguments.

3 Public Key Cryptography and Digital Signature

Let the number of elements in the plain message (or plain signature message) be μ, and the number of elements in the encrypted message (or encrypted signature message) be ν, where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu \leq \nu$. Let E be $\mathbb{F}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}}$, and $\mathsf{G} \subseteq \mathsf{E}$ be the set from which plain message elements are sampled. If the number of plain and encrypted (or plain and signed) messages are the same, then a multivariate bijective mapping $P : \mathsf{G}^\mu \to \mathsf{G}^\mu$ is chosen and advertised in the public key lookup table T, while P^{-1} is saved in the back substitution table B. Let $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu) \in \mathsf{G}^\mu$ be plain message. For public key cryptography, the encrypted message is $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\mu) = P(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$, and the decryption is $P^{-1}(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\mu)$. For digital signature, the signed message is $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\mu) = P^{-1}(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$, and recovered message is $P(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\mu)$. In the remaining part of the section, it is assumed that $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu - 1$. Let $\nu = \mu + \lambda$, for some positive integer λ. Let κ be the number of padding message elements in the hashing keys. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_\mu) \in \mathsf{G}^\mu$ be the plain

message, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_\nu) \in \mathsf{E}^\nu$ be the encrypted or signed message, and $\omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa) \in \mathsf{G}^\kappa$ be a padding message. The multivariate mappings in the rest of this section are expressions from either $\mathsf{E}[t_1, \ldots, t_m, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n]$ or $\mathcal{EXP}(\mathsf{E}; [t_1, \ldots, t_m, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n])$, for some appropriate variable names t and σ, and subscript numbers m and n, depending on the context of occurrence and arity of the mappings.

3.1 Hashing Keys

The following subroutine generates the hashing keys required by the algorithms of sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Subroutine for Generation of Hashing Keys The table generated is the private key hash table H, containing the hashing keys.

1. The following inputs to the subroutine are taken: positive integers μ, κ, L, λ, and a binary flag SIGN, where L is the number of hashing keys, $L \leq \lambda$, and SIGN is set to the binary value `true`, if this subroutine is called for digital signature, and set to `false` for public key cryptography.
2. The private key hash table H is initialized to empty set. The input parameters are saved in the private key hash table H. Let $\nu = \mu + \lambda$.
3. Let $f_l(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, for $1 \leq l \leq L$, be selected and saved in the private key hash table H. If $L < \lambda$, let $Q_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, for $1 \leq i \leq \lambda - L$, be selected and saved in the private key hash table H. The chosen functions are required to evaluate to elements in G, for $(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \in \mathsf{G}^{\mu+\kappa}$. Let $\boldsymbol{F(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \big(f_1(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \ldots, f_L(\mathbf{x}, \omega)\big)}$.
4. Now, a parametric multivariate injective mapping $\eta(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_L)$, is selected such that $\eta^{-1}(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$ can be computed easily (discussed in section 2.1). The multivariate mappings required to compute both $\eta(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$ and $\eta^{-1}(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$ are saved in the private key hash table H. If SIGN is set to `true`, then this procedure is called for generating digital signature hashing keys, and hence, let $g_l(y_1, \ldots, y_\lambda) = \eta_l^{-1}(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; (y_{\lambda-L+1}, \ldots, y_\lambda))$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, which are also saved in the private key hash table H.
5. Let $Q_{\lambda-L+i}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \boldsymbol{\eta_i\big(Q_1(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \ldots, Q_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{x}, \omega);\ F(\mathbf{x}, \omega)\big)}$, $1 \leq i \leq L$, which are saved in the private key hash table H. Thus, for $(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \in \mathsf{G}^{\mu+\kappa}$, $F(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \boldsymbol{\eta^{-1}\big(Q_1(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \ldots, Q_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{x}, \omega);\ (Q_{\lambda-L+1}(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \ldots, Q_\lambda(\mathbf{x}, \omega))\big)}$. The parametric multivariate injective mapping $\eta(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$ are required to be so chosen that (i) it is easily expressible as a multivariate mapping, for public key cryptography, and (ii) $\eta^{-1}(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; \mathbf{z})$ and $g_l(y_1, \ldots, y_\lambda)$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, are easily expressible as multivariate mappings, for digital signature, and for signature authentication, the multivariate mappings $Q_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, must occur as public key mappings, which need to be easily expressible, as well.

3.2 Public Key Cryptography (PKC)

The input is the private key hash table H, containing the hashing keys.

Public Key Cryptography Key Generation Algorithm The tables generated are as follows: (1) the private key back substitution table B, containing information for decryption of public key encrypted message, and (2) the public key lookup table T, containing the multivariate mappings for encrypting plain message.

1. The subroutine for generation of hashing keys (described in section 3.1) is called, which takes input parameters, *viz.*, positive integers μ, κ, L, λ, and a binary flag SIGN, which is set to `false` by the calling function, generates the multivariate mappings $f_l(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, and $Q_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, sets $\nu = \mu + \lambda$, and saves them in the private key hash table H. The private key back substitution table B is initialized to empty set.
2. A parametric multivariate injective mapping $\zeta(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ is selected such that the parametric inverse multivariate mapping $\zeta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{y})$ can be computed easily (discussed in section 2.1). The information required to compute $\zeta(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ and $\zeta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{y})$ is saved in the private key back substitution table B. Let $Q_{\lambda+i}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \zeta_i(f_1(\mathbf{x}, \omega), \ldots, f_L(\mathbf{x}, \omega); \mathbf{x})$, $1 \leq i \leq \mu$.
3. An invertible affine linear transformation $T : \mathsf{E}^\nu \to \mathsf{E}^\nu$ is selected, and its inverse transformation T^{-1} is saved in the back substitution table B.
4. Let $\big(\boldsymbol{P_1(x, \omega), \ldots, P_\nu(x, \omega)}\big) = \boldsymbol{T}\big(\boldsymbol{Q_1(x, \omega), \ldots, Q_\nu(x, \omega)}\big)$ be the encryption multivariate mappings, which are advertised in the public key lookup table T, along with μ, ν, κ, E and G.

Encryption Let $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$ be the plain message. The encryptor chooses padding message $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa \in \mathbb{F}$, computes $\epsilon_i = P_i(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$, $1 \leq i \leq \nu$, and transmits $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu)$ to the receiver.

Decryption The input items required for decryption are read from the private key hash table H and the private key back substitution table B. The decryption algorithm is as follows:

1. Let $\big(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu\big) \in \mathsf{E}^\nu$ be the received encrypted message.
2. Let $\big(v_1, \ldots, v_\nu\big) = T^{-1}\big(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu\big)$. Thus, $v_i = Q_i(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$, $1 \leq i \leq \nu$, where $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$ is the plain message (to be decrypted in the subsequent steps), and $(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$ is the padding message, which will not be decrypted. Let $y_l = v_l$, $1 \leq l \leq \lambda$.
3. Let $(z_1, \ldots, z_L) = \eta^{-1}\big(y_1, \ldots, y_{\lambda-L}; (y_{\lambda-L+1}, \ldots, y_\lambda)\big)$. It is clear that $z_l = f_l(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$, $1 \leq l \leq L$.
4. The plain message is $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu) = \zeta^{-1}\big(z_1, \ldots, z_L;\ (v_{\lambda+1}, \ldots, v_\nu)\big)$.

3.3 Digital Signature (DS)

The input is the private key hash table H, containing the hashing keys.

Digital Signature Key Generation Algorithm The tables generated are as follows: (1) the private key digital signature table S, containing information for signing the plain message, (2) the public key signature verification table V, containing the multivariate mappings for recovery of plain message, and (3) the public key signature authentication table A, containing the multivariate mappings for verifying the authentication of the plain message.

1. The subroutine for generation of hashing keys (described in section 3.1) is called, which takes input parameters, *viz.*, positive integers μ, κ, L, λ, and a binary flag SIGN, which is set to `true` by the calling function now, generates the multivariate mappings $f_l(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $g_l\big(z_1, \ldots, z_\lambda\big)$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, and $Q_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, such that $f_l(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \boldsymbol{g_l\big(Q_1(x, \omega), \ldots, Q_\lambda(x, \omega)\big)}$, for $(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \in \mathbb{F}^{\mu+\kappa}$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, sets $\nu = \mu + \lambda$, and saves them in the private key hash table H. The private key signature table S is initialized to empty set.
2. A parametric multivariate bijective mapping $\zeta(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ from G^μ into G^μ is selected such that the parametric inverse $\zeta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ can be computed easily (discussed in section 2.1). The information required to compute $\zeta(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ and $\zeta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_L; \mathbf{x})$ is saved in the private key signature table S.
3. Let $P_i(y_1, \ldots, y_\nu) = \zeta_i\big(g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_\lambda), \ldots, g_L(y_1, \ldots, y_\lambda); (y_{\lambda+1}, \ldots, y_\nu)\big)$, $1 \leq i \leq \mu$, be the signature verification multivariate mappings which are advertised in the public key signature verification table V, along with μ, ν, κ, E and G, and let the plain message authentication multivariate mappings be $S_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = Q_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, which are advertised in the public key signature authentication table A, along with μ, ν, κ, E and G. The signature verification table V is advertised as a public key, with read permissions for the intended receiver to access. There are two possibilities for signature authentication verification: (*i*) a public authority, that is responsible for providing signature authentication ascertainment and for possible issuance of a certification to that effect, is identified, which is referred to herein as a trusted authentication verifier (TAV), in which case, the padding message is transmitted to the intended receiver, possibly encrypting it by a public or shared key encryption algorithm, whereas the decryption key for the padding message and the signature authentication table A are shared by the signer with only the TAV, or (*ii*) there is no TAV, in which case, the signature authentication table A and the signature verification table V are made available, with read access permissions, to the intended receiver as a public key.

Digital Signing Algorithm Let $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$ be the plain message. The parameters required for digital signing are read from the private key hash table H and the private key signature table S. The digital signing algorithm is as follows:

1. The signer chooses padding message $(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa) \in \mathsf{G}^\kappa$, either generating them randomly, or based on previous correspondences.
2. The signer computes the hash values $z_l = f_l(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$, $1 \leq l \leq L$, the authentication header entries $\epsilon_i = Q_i(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, and the signed message entries $(\epsilon_{\lambda+1}, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu) = \zeta^{-1}(z_1, \ldots, z_L; (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu))$.

3. The signature message is $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu)$, which is transmitted to the intended receiver, while the padding message $(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$ is either transmitted to the intended receiver together with the signature, either on demand or for free, or communicated to a trusted authentication verifier (TAV), with which the signer registers the signature authentication table A.

Digital Signature Verification Algorithm The input items required for signature verification are public key signature verification table V, and the signature authentication table A or a method for ascertaining by a trusted authentication verifier (TAV). The signature verification algorithm is as follows:

1. Let $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu)$ be the received signature message. The padding $(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$ may have also been optionally received.
2. Let $\xi_i = P_i(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_\nu)$, $1 \leq i \leq \mu$. The plain signature message is $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu)$. The public key signature verification table V contains the information required in this step.
3. If the signature authentication table A is available, then the authentication of the plain message can be verified by testing whether $S_i(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa) = \epsilon_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$; otherwise, a public authority TAV, that is responsible for signature authentication ascertainment, may be approached.

4 Complexity Analysis of Computing Nonparametric Inverses of Parametric Multivariate Polynomial Mappings

Model theory of fields and polynomial algebras is extensively studied in mathematical logic [12, 14, 20, 35, 36]. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field, and let $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$ be the set of arithmetic expressions without quantifiers, obtained by collecting the expressions involving any number of finitely many variables, constructed using parentheses and the binary or unary arithmetic operators of addition $+$, subtraction $-$, multiplication $\cdot$, possibly division $/$, exponentiation ^{k}, where k is a positive integer, and binary valued relational operator $=$ (and possibly other relational operators such as $<$, $>$, $\leq$ and $\geq$). The relational operators allow construction of assertions that evaluate to anyone of the special symbolic constants `false` and `true`, represented by 0 and 1, respectively. In the sequel, the variables assume values from $\mathbb{F}$, the arithmetic expressions evaluate to values in $\mathbb{F}$, as defined by the arithmetic operations in $\mathbb{F}$, and the assertions evaluate to values in $\{0, 1\}$. A variable taking values in $\{0, 1\}$ is a boolean variable. The arithmetic expressions in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ are boolean expressions. For any field $\mathbb{F}$, a boolean variable x can be obtained from the equation $x^2 - x = 0$. For boolean variables x and y, $\neg x$ can be represented by $1 - x$, $x \wedge y$ by $x \cdot y$, $x \vee y$ by $1 - (1 - x) \cdot (1 - y)$, $x \oplus y$ by $(x - y)^2$, $x \rightarrow y$ by $1 - x \cdot (1 - y)$, and $x \leftrightarrow y$ by $1 - (x - y)^2$, where $\neg$ denotes the logical "negation", $\wedge$ the logical

"and", $\vee$ the logical "or", $\oplus$ the logical "exclusive or", $\rightarrow$ the logical "implies", and $\leftrightarrow$ the logical "implies and is implied by". Let $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$ be the set of arithmetic expressions in which some (none, some or all) variables are constrained by "existential" $\exists$ or "universal" $\forall$ quantifiers. A variable constrained by a quantifier is called a *bound* variable. A variable that is not bound is called a *free* variable. An arithmetic expression in which all the variables are free is a quantifier free arithmetic expression, *i.e.*, an expression in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$. A quantified arithmetic expression is in prenex normal form, if all the quantifiers occur before the otherwise quantifier free arithmetic expression, *i.e*, a quantified arithmetic expression of the form $\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{i-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_i} \exists x_i \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \quad f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, where m and n are positive integers, and k_i, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, are nonnegative integers such that $k_i \leq k_{i+1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and $k_m \leq n$. The variables y_j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, are *independent* variables, as they are bound to universal quantifiers. The variable x_i depends on the variables y_j, $1 \leq j \leq k_i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, and is a *dependent* bound variable. A tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_i, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_i}) \in \mathbb{F}^{i+k_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, is *feasible* to a quantified arithmetic expression in prenex normal form with no free variables as described before, if either $i = m$ and $f(a_1, \ldots, a_m, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_m}, y_{k_m+1}, \ldots, y_n)$ evaluates to 1, for $y_{k_m+1}, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{F}$, or $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ and each tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_i, x_{i+1}, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_i}, y_{k_i+1}, \ldots, y_{k_{i+1}})$, for $y_{k_i+1}, \ldots, y_{k_{i+1}} \in \mathbb{F}$, and for some $x_{i+1} \in \mathbb{F}$, depending on $y_{k_i+1}, \ldots, y_{k_{i+1}}$, is feasible. If for every $b_1, \ldots, b_{k_1} \in \mathbb{F}$, there exists $a_1 \in \mathbb{F}$, such that the tuple $(a_1, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_1})$ is feasible, then the given instance of binary valued quantified arithmetic expression is *satisfiable*. The evaluation problem for quantified boolean expressions in prenex normal form with no free variables in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$ is to find whether the given input instance is satisfiable. Let $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$ be the set of satisfiable binary valued quantified arithmetic expressions (*i.e.*, quantified arithmetic assertions) in prenex normal form with no free variables that evaluate to `true`. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$ be $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(Z_2)$ and $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(Z_2)$, respectively. By the previous discussion, every boolean expression in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, analogously in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$, can be represented by some arithmetic expression in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$, analogously in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$, with equality binary relation, for any field $\mathbb{F}$. The evaluation problem for quantified boolean expressions in prenex normal form with no free variables in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is PSPACE-complete, where PSPACE is the set of formal languages acceptable in polynomial space [25].

4.1 Constraint Satisfaction Problem

Let $\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{i-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_i} \exists x_i \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \; f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ be an instance in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$,

where m and n are positive integers, and k_i, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, are nonnegative integers such that $k_i \leq k_{i+1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and $k_m \leq n$. A tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_r, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_r}) \in \mathbb{F}^{r+k_r}$, $1 \leq r \leq m$, is *functionally feasible by quantifier free arithmetic expressions* to the given constraint satisfaction problem, if there exist quantifier free arithmetic expressions $g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1})$ and $g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$, $2 \leq i \leq m$, in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$, such that the following holds: $\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_n \; f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \texttt{true}$, where $x_1 = g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1}), x_i = g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i}), 2 \leq i \leq m, g_1(b_1, \ldots, b_{k_1}) = a_1$ and $g_i(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b_1, \ldots, b_{k_i}) = a_i$, $2 \leq i \leq r$. It can be observed that for a finite field $\mathbb{F}$, a feasible tuple is also functionally feasible by quantifier free arithmetic expressions. A solution to the constraint satisfaction problem is to find quantifier free arithmetic expressions, if and when they exist, $g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1})$ for x_1 and $g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ for x_i, $2 \leq i \leq m$, such that for all $y_1 \ldots y_n \in \mathbb{F}$, $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 1$, where $x_1 = g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1})$ and $x_i = g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$, for $2 \leq i \leq m$. The constraint satisfaction problem is feasible, if it has a solution in quantifier free arithmetic expressions.

Theorem 1 *The constraint satisfaction problem for binary valued instances in prenex normal form with no free variables in* $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$ *is* PSPACE*-hard.*

Proof. Let

$$\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \; f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$$

where m and n are positive integers and k_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, are integers such that $0 \leq k_i \leq k_{i+1} \leq n$, $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, be a given instance of binary valued quantified boolean expression with no free variables in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ for the evaluation problem. Let

$$\begin{array}{l} \exists w_1 \quad \forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \;\; \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \\ \quad \exists t_1 \ldots \exists t_{k_1} \forall v_1 \ldots \exists t_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \exists t_{k_m} \forall v_m \;\; \exists t_{k_m+1} \ldots \exists t_n \\ [\; w_1 \wedge f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \;] \vee \; [\; (\neg w_1) \wedge (\neg f(v_1, \ldots, v_m, t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \;] \end{array}$$

be an instance to the constraint satisfaction problem with no free variables, which can be easily shown to be in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$, since feasibility coincides with functional feasibility by arithmetic expressions for $\mathbb{Z}_2$. The input binary valued quantified boolean expression evaluates to 1 if and only if w_1 is 1 in any solution to the constructed instance of the constraint satisfaction problem. Now, as discussed at the beginning of the section, the field $\mathbb{Z}_2$, together with all its arithmetic and logical operations, can be emulated by the arithmetic operations and equality operator with any field $\mathbb{F}$. Thus, the constraint satisfaction problem for $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$, which includes equivalent binary valued quantified arithmetic expressions for those in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$, is PSPACE-hard. ■

4.2 Quantifier Elimination Problem

Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{F})$ be a set of parametric subsets of $\mathbb{F}$, parametrized by variables assuming values in $\mathbb{F}$, such that the binary valued characteristic functions of the sets are assertions in $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$. Now, for an instance in $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$, the quantifier elimination problem is to compute parametric sets $G_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1})$ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{F})$, for $y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1} \in \mathbb{F}$, and $G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{F})$, for $x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i} \in \mathbb{F}$, $2 \leq i \leq m$, such that $G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ $= \{x_i \in \mathbb{F} : (x_1, \ldots, x_i, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ is feasible to the given instance$\}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $\mathbb{F}$ is the field of rational numbers, with the set of binary relations $\{=, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$ and the set of constants $\{0, 1\}$, then the emptiness testing of parametric subsets of $\mathbb{F}^n$, for an arbitrary positive integer n, where the characteristic functions of the parametric subsets are binary valued quantified arithmetic expressions, is decidable (or computable), and quantifier elimination is possible, *i.e.*, equivalent quantifier free arithmetic assertions can be computed for the quantified arithmetic assertions as characteristic functions for the parametric subsets of $\mathbb{F}^n$ [12, 14, 35, 47]. Thus, $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$ admits quantifier elimination, and the sets of feasibility tuples for instances in $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$ have characteristic functions in $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$, that can be computed by an algorithm. Set solutions can be enumerated by backtracking method [26]. By the same proof of Theorem 1, the quantifier elimination problem can be shown to be PSPACE-hard.

Theorem 2 *The constraint satisfaction problem for binary valued instances in prenex normal form with no free variables in* $\mathcal{ARITH}$-$\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$*, that have unique solutions, is* PSPACE*-hard.*

Proof. Let

$$\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \; f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$$

be an instance in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ for the quantifier elimination problem in prenex normal form with no free variables. Let $X_i(x_1, \ldots, x_i, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ be the characteristic function of the set $G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$, for $x_1, \ldots, x_i, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $X_{i,b}(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i}) = X_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, b, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$, for $x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. In the remaining part of the proof, the sets $G_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$ are represented by the pair of boolean functions $X_{i,b}(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i})$, for $x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_i} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. The pair of boolean functions $X_{m,b}(x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_m})$ of the set $G_m(x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_m})$ are the solutions to the boolean variables $v_{m,b}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, respectively, for $x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_m} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, for the following instance of constraint satisfaction problem:

$$\begin{array}{l} \forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \forall x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \quad \exists v_{m,0} \quad \exists v_{m,1} \quad \forall x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \\ \{ \quad ((v_{m,0} = 1) \rightarrow (x_m = 0)) \wedge ((v_{m,1} = 1) \rightarrow (x_m = 1)) \wedge \\ \qquad\qquad ((v_{m,0} \vee v_{m,1}) \leftrightarrow f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)) \quad \} \end{array}$$

After obtaining the boolean functions $X_{i+1,\,b}(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_i,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_{i+1}})$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, of $G_{i+1}(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_i,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_{i+1}})$, the boolean functions $X_{i,\,b}(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_{i-1},\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_i})$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, of $G_i(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_{i-1},\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_i})$, for $x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_i,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_{i+1}} \in \mathbb{F}$, are the solutions to the boolean variables $v_{i,\,b}$, $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, respectively, for the following instance of constraint satisfaction problem:

$$\forall y_1\,\ldots\,\forall y_{k_1}\;\forall x_1\,\ldots\,\forall y_{k_{i-1}+1}\,\ldots\,\forall y_{k_i}\;\;\exists v_{i,\,0}\;\;\exists v_{i,\,1}\;\;\forall x_i\,\forall y_{k_i+1}\,\ldots\,\forall y_{k_{i+1}}$$
$$\Big\{\;\big((v_{i,\,0}=1)\;\rightarrow\;(x_i=0)\big)\;\;\wedge\;\;\big((v_{i,\,1}=1)\;\rightarrow\;(x_i=1)\big)\;\;\wedge\;\;\big[\;(v_{i,\,0}\vee v_{i,\,1})\quad\leftrightarrow$$
$$\big(X_{i+1,\,0}(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_i,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_{i+1}})\;\;\vee\;\;X_{i+1,\,1}(x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_i,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_{k_{i+1}})\big)\;\;\big]\;\;\Big\}$$

Now, for avoiding the possibility of dependence of a solution for $v_{i,\,1}$ on $v_{i,\,0}$, the formulas in the above are encoded treating the variables in pairs, representing $v_{i,\,b}$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, by a single variable $v_i = (v_{i,\,0},\,v_{i,\,1})$, and perhaps performing the required computations in $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Thus, the encoding contains only a single dependent variable v_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, and either component of it depends only on the variables constrained by universal quantifiers occurring before the lone existential quantifier. There is a unique solution separately for each component $v_{i,\,b}$ of the dependent variable v_i, which is the same as that for the instance obtained by substituting b for each occurrence of the independent variable x_i, replacing the subexpression $(v_{i,\,b} \vee v_{i,\,b\oplus 1})$ with $v_{i,\,b}$, and discarding the other subexpression containing the variable $v_{i,\,b\oplus 1}$ and the quantifiers constraining the variables x_i and $v_{i,\,b\oplus 1}$, for $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. Now, as discussed in the beginning of the section, the field $\mathbb{Z}_2$, together with all its arithmetic and logical operations, can be emulated by the arithmetic operations and equality operator with any field $\mathbb{F}$. The characteristic functions of set solutions to the quantifier elimination problem for binary valued instances in prenex normal form with no free variables in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbb{F})$, which includes $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, are unique. Thus, the constraint satisfaction problem for instances in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$, that have unique solutions, is PSPACE-hard, since the stated set of instances also contains those instances encoding the characteristic functions for quantifier elimination problem for instances in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. ■

4.3 Parametric Multivariate Polynomial Mappings

In this subsection, let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field. For integers $l \geq 0$, $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping, with $z_1, \ldots, z_l$ as parameters, is $\eta(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x}) = (\eta_1(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x}),\,\ldots,\,\eta_n(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x}))$, where $\mathbf{z} = (z_1,\,\ldots,\,z_l)$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_m)$, and $\eta_i(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[z_1,\,\ldots,\,z_l,\,x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_m]$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. A parametric left inverse $\eta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{y})$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_n)$, of a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping $\eta(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x})$ on $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}^l \times \mathbb{F}^m$ is as follows: for every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^l$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, such that $(z_1,\,\ldots,\,z_l,\,x_1,\,\ldots,\,x_m) \in X$, if $\eta(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, then $\eta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}$. A parametric right inverse $\eta^{\natural}(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{y})$ on $Y \subseteq \mathbb{F}^l \times \mathbb{F}^n$ of a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping $\eta(\mathbf{z};\,\mathbf{x})$ is as follows: for every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^l$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, such that $(z_1,\,\ldots,\,z_l,\,y_1,\,\ldots,\,y_n) \in Y$,

if $\eta^{\natural}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}$, then $\eta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$. For $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^l$, let $S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$, and $S^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y})$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, be as follows: $S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_l, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{F}^l \times \mathbb{F}^n \,:\, \eta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}\}$, and $S^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y}) = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_l, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{F}^l \times \mathbb{F}^m \,:\, \eta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}\}$. Now, the following statements hold: (1) for $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^l$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m$, the set $S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x})$ contains exactly one element; (2) for $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}^l$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the set $S^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y})$ may be empty or nonempty; (3) a parametric left inverse $\eta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y})$ can be defined on the set $\bigcup_{(z_1, \ldots, z_l, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in X} S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x})$ if and only if $S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) \cap S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset$, for $(z_1, \ldots, z_l, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $(z_1, \ldots, z_l, x'_1, \ldots, x'_m) \in X$, $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}'$; and (4) a parametric right inverse $\eta^{\natural}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y})$ can be defined on the set Y if and only if $S^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{y}) \neq \emptyset$, for every $(z_1, \ldots, z_l, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in Y$. If a parametric left inverse (similarly, a parametric right inverse) of a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping does not depend on the parameters, then it is nonparametric. Let

$$T^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) = \bigcup_{(z_1, \ldots, z_l,\ x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in X} \left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n \,:\, \eta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}\right\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$T^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{y}) = \bigcap_{(z_1, \ldots, z_l,\ y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in Y} \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}^m \,:\, \eta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}\right\}$$

Then, on the set $\bigcup_{(z_1, \ldots, z_l,\ x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in X} S^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x})$, a nonparametric left inverse $\eta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{y})$ can be defined if and only if $T^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) \cap T^{\sharp}_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}') = \emptyset$, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{F}^m$, $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}'$, and on the set Y, a nonparametric right inverse $\eta^{\natural}(\mathbf{y})$ can be defined if and only if $T^{\natural}_{\eta}(\mathbf{y}) \neq \emptyset$, for $(z_1, \ldots, z_l, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in Y$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}^n$. A parametric inverse is simultaneously a parametric left inverse and a parametric right inverse. If a parametric inverse does not depend on the parameters, then it is nonparametic.

Theorem 3 *The computational problems of finding nonparametric left inverses as quantifier free arithmetic expressions and nonparametric right inverses as quantifier free arithmetic expressions of parametric multivariate polynomial mappings from $\mathbb{Z}_2^m$ into $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ with l parameters, for arbitrary nonnegative integer l and positive integers m and n, for the instances for which the stated inverses exist, are both* PSPACE*-hard.*

Proof. Let $\forall y_1, \ldots, \forall y_k\ \exists w_0\ \exists w_1\ \forall y_{k+1}, \ldots, \forall y_n\ f(w_0, w_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$, for some positive integer n and nonnegative integer $k \leq n$, be an instance for the constraint satisfaction problem, having unique solutions for each of the dependent variables w_b separately as quantifier free boolean expressions $g_b(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in \mathit{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{Z}_2)$, for $b \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. For $w_0, w_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, let $h_0(w_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = f(0, w_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \oplus f(1, w_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, and let $h_1(w_0, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = f(w_0, 0, y_1, \ldots, y_n) \oplus f(w_0, 1, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. Let $\zeta(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{k+2})$, be a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+2}$ into $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+5}$, with parameters $z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k}$ as follows: $\zeta_i(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = x_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\zeta_{k+1}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = f(x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, x_1, \ldots, x_k, z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$, $\zeta_{k+2}(\mathbf{z};\, \mathbf{x}) = h_0(x_{k+2}, x_1, \ldots, x_k, z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$,

$\zeta_{k+3}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = [\neg\zeta_{k+2}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x})] \wedge x_{k+1}\ \zeta_{k+4}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = h_1(x_{k+1}, x_1, \ldots, x_k, z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$, and $\zeta_{k+5}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = [\neg\zeta_{k+4}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x})] \wedge x_{k+2}$, Now, if $\zeta(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{k+5})$, then $x_i = y_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $x_{k+1} = [(\neg y_{k+2}) \wedge y_{k+3}] \vee y_{k+2} \wedge \big[\big((\neg y_{k+1}) \wedge (\neg g_0(y_1, \ldots, y_k))\big) \vee \big(y_{k+1} \wedge g_0(y_1, \ldots, y_k)\big)\big]$, and $x_{k+2} = [(\neg y_{k+4}) \wedge y_{k+5}] \vee y_{k+4} \wedge \big[\big((\neg y_{k+1}) \wedge (\neg g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_k))\big) \vee \big(y_{k+1} \wedge g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_k)\big)\big]$. Thus, a nonparametric left inverse $\zeta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{y})$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{k+5})$, of $\zeta(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x})$ can be defined for $(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k}, x_1, \ldots, x_{k+2}) \in X = \mathbb{Z}_2^{n-k} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{k+2}$ $\big($hence $\zeta^{\sharp}(\mathbf{y})$ can be defined on $Y = \mathbb{Z}_2^{n-k} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{k+5}\big)$, and computing nonparametric left inverses of parametric multivariate polynomial mappings is PSPACE-hard. Let $\eta(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{k+2})$, be a parametric multivariate polynomial mapping from $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1}$ into $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1}$, with parameters $z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k}$ as follows: $\eta_i(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = x_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\eta_{k+1}(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = f(x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, x_1, \ldots, x_k, z_1, \ldots, z_{n-k})$. Now, if $\eta(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{k+1})$, then $x_i = y_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $x_{k+1} = g_0(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$, and $x_{k+2} = g_1(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$. Thus, a nonparametric right inverse $\eta^{\natural}(\mathbf{y})$ of $\eta(\mathbf{z};\ \mathbf{x})$ can be defined on $Y = \mathbb{Z}_2^{n-k} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{k} \times \{1\}$, with $y_{k+1} = 1$ in $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_k, y_{k+1})$, and computing nonparametric right inverses of parametric multivariate polynomial mappings is PSPACE-hard. ■

4.4 Simultaneous Multivariate Polynomial Equations over $\mathbb{F}$

Let $l, m, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_i\big(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n\big) \in \mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}(\mathbb{F})$, for $1 \leq i \leq l$, be binary valued arithmetic expressions. A system of polynomial equations is the following:

$$f_i\big(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n\big) \quad = \quad 1\,, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq l\,, \tag{1}$$

where y_j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, are independent variables and x_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, are dependent variables, assuming values from $\mathbb{F}$, both specified as part of an instance. The problem of solving a system of polynomial equations is to compute the solution as a maximal set $G_1\big(y_1, \ldots, y_n\big) \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, for x_1, and, for each $a_1 \in G_1\big(y_1, \ldots, y_n\big)$, $\ldots$, and $a_{i-1} \in G_{i-1}\big(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-2}, y_1, \ldots, y_n\big)$, a maximal set $G_i\big(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, y_1, \ldots, y_n\big) \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, for x_i and $2 \leq i \leq m$, such that for each tuple $\big(b_1, \ldots, b_n\big) \in \mathbb{F}^n$,

$$\begin{array}{l} f_i\big(a_1, \ldots, a_m, b_1, \ldots, b_n\big) \quad = \quad 1\,, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq n\,, \qquad \text{whenever} \\ a_1 \in G_1\big(b_1, \ldots, b_n\big) \ \text{ and } \ a_i \in G_i\big(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, b_1, \ldots, b_n\big)\,, \ \ 2 \leq i \leq m \end{array}$$

In the above system, the ordering of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ appears specified. However, this ordering can be made innocuous by additional constraints as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_{1,1} & w_{1,2} & \ldots & w_{1,m} \\ w_{2,1} & w_{2,2} & \ldots & w_{2,m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{m,1} & w_{m,2} & \ldots & w_{m,m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} x_{m+1} \\ x_{m+2} \\ \vdots \\ x_{2m} \end{bmatrix} \quad = \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} w_{i,j} \ = \ 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{\substack{1 \leq l \leq m \\ l \neq j}} (1 + w_{i,l}) \ = \ 1\,, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m \quad \text{and}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} w_{i,j} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{\substack{1 \le k \le m \\ k \ne i}} (1 + w_{k,j}) = 1, \quad 1 \le j \le m$$

$$f_i(x_{m+1}, \ldots, x_{2m}, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 1, \qquad 1 \le i \le l$$

where y_j, $1 \le j \le n$, are independent variables, and all the remaining variables are dependent variables. The ordering is concealed by allowing the system to choose an appropriate ordering of the variables $x_{m+1}, \ldots, x_{2m}$, while allowing $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ to appear in the specified order. In the above set of constraints, for each row of the matrix $\left[w_{i,j}\right]_{1 \le i,j \le m}$, for the constraints on i, $1 \le i \le m$, and for each column of the matrix $\left[w_{i,j}\right]_{1 \le i,j \le m}$, for the constraints on j, $1 \le j \le m$, the first constraint requires at least one entry of 1, and the second constraint requires $(m-1)$ entries of 0, in the respective row or column, and the matrix $\left[w_{i,j}\right]_{1 \le i,j \le m}$ is a permutation matrix.

Theorem 4 *The constraint satisfaction problem for instances in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$ is polynomial time reducible to the problem of solving systems of polynomial equations.*

Proof. For positive integers m and n, let $\mathcal{Q}_1 v_1 \ldots \mathcal{Q}_{m+n} v_{m+n}\ f(v_1, \ldots, v_{m+n}) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$, such that for some permutation of indexes $\{i_1, \ldots, i_m, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_{m+n}\}$ of the set of indexes $\{1, \ldots, m, m+1, \ldots, m+n\}$, $v_{i_r} = x_r$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{i_r} = \exists$, for $1 \le r \le m$, and $v_{i_{m+l}} = y_r$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{i_{m+l}} = \forall$, for $1 \le l \le n$. The variables x_r, $1 \le r \le m$, and y_l, $1 \le l \le n$, are named in such a way that $i_1 < \ldots < i_m$ and $i_{m+1} < \ldots < i_{m+n}$. Let $S_r = \{0\} \cup \{i_{m+l} : i_{m+l} < i_r \text{ and } 1 \le l \le n\}$ and $k_r = \max S_r$, $1 \le r \le m$.

Let $f_{l,b}(v_1, \ldots, v_{m+n}) = f(v_1, \ldots, v_{m+n})\big|_{v_{i_{m+l}} = b}$ be the quantifier free boolean polynomial expression obtained by substituting the bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$, for the variable $v_{i_{m+l}}$, for $1 \le l \le n$. The variable $v_{i_{m+l}}$ appears in the list of parameters of $f_{l,b}(v_1, \ldots, v_{m+n})$, $1 \le l \le n$, although it plays no role, *i.e.*, the value of the function is the same whether $v_{i_{m+l}} = 0$ or $v_{i_{m+l}} = 1$. Let $w_{i,l,b}$, $1 \le i \le m+n$, $1 \le l \le n$, $b \in \{0, 1\}$, be new boolean variables. Then, for each r and l, where $1 \le r \le m$ and $1 \le l \le n$, the system of polynomial equations

$$\begin{aligned}
& v_{i_{m+k}} = y_k, \quad w_{i_{m+k},l,0} = y_k, \quad w_{i_{m+k},l,1} = y_k, && 1 \le k, l \le n \\
& f(v_1, \ldots, v_m, v_{m+1}, \ldots, v_{m+n}) = 1, && 1 \le l \le n \\
& f_{l,0}(w_{1,l,0}, \ldots, w_{m,l,0}, w_{m+1,l,0}, \ldots, w_{m+n,l,0}) = 1, && 1 \le l \le n \\
& f_{l,1}(w_{1,l,1}, \ldots, w_{m,l,1}, w_{m+1,l,1}, \ldots, w_{m+n,l,1}) = 1, && 1 \le l \le n \\
& v_{i_r} + w_{i_r,l,0} = 0, \quad k_r + 1 \le l \le n, \quad \text{if } k_r < n, && 1 \le r \le m \\
& v_{i_r} + w_{i_r,l,1} = 0, \quad k_r + 1 \le l \le n, \quad \text{if } k_r < n, && 1 \le r \le m, \quad \text{and} \\
& x_r + v_{i_r} = 0, && 1 \le r \le m,
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the complete solution for x_r, $1 \le r \le m$, must agree with $w_{i_r,l,0}$ as well as with $w_{i_r,l,1}$, $k_r + 1 \le l \le n$, which admit a complete solution that is independent of y_l, whenever $k_r < n$. Thus the complete solution of the above system of equations yields a complete solution for the instance $\mathcal{Q}_1 v_1 \ldots \mathcal{Q}_{m+n} v_{m+n}\ f(v_1, \ldots, v_{m+n})$ of the constraint satisfaction problem in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}$. ■

Theorem 5 *The quantifier elimination problem for instances in* $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$ *is polynomial time reducible to the problem of solving systems of polynomial equations.*

Proof. Let $\forall y_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_1} \exists x_1 \ldots \forall y_{k_{i-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_i} \exists x_i \ldots \forall y_{k_{m-1}+1} \ldots \forall y_{k_m} \exists x_m \forall y_{k_m+1} \ldots \forall y_n \;\; f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ be an instance in $\mathcal{ARITH}\text{-}\mathcal{EXP}_{\mathcal{Q}-\mathrm{SAT}}(\mathbb{F})$, let v_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$ and t_j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, be new variables, and let

$$\begin{array}{rcll} f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n) & = & 1 & \\ f(v_1, \ldots, v_m, t_1, \ldots, t_n) & = & 1 & \text{and} \\ (y_1 = t_1) \wedge \ldots \wedge (y_{k_i} = t_{k_i}) & \rightarrow & (x_1 = v_1) \wedge \ldots \wedge (x_i = v_i)\,, & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m \end{array}$$

be an instance of system of simultaneous polynomial equations, which is referred to in this proof as the combined system of polynomial equations. It can be easily seen that the solution to the quantifier elimination problem is also a solution for the system of simultaneous polynomial equations, and therefore, it remains to be shown that a solution for the quantifier elimination problem is maximal for the corresponding instance of combined system of simultaneous polynomial equations. To this end, it can be observed that for any maximal set solution $G'_1(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, for x_1, such that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 1$, for some $x_2, \ldots, x_m \in \mathbb{F}$, and any maximal set solution $H'_1(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, for v_1, such that $f(v_1, \ldots, v_m, t_1, \ldots, t_n) = 1$, for some $v_2, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{F}$, the maximal set solution for x_1 of the combined system is included in $\bigcap_{t_{k_1+1}, \ldots, t_n \in \mathbb{F}} H'_1(y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1}, t_{k_1+1}, \ldots, t_n) \cap G'_1(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, which is included in a maximal set solution for x_1, such that the following holds: $\forall t_{k_1+1} \ldots \forall t_n f(x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_{k_1}, t_{k_1+1}, \ldots, t_n) = 1$, for some $x_i \in \mathbb{F}$, $2 \leq i \leq m$. Thus, a maximal set solution for x_1 of the combined system of polynomial equations is included in that for the quantifier elimination problem, and analogously, for x_i, as can be shown by induction on i, for $2 \leq i \leq m$. ■

It can be observed that the reduction proposed in the proof of Theorem 5 simplifies the result presented in [47]. For an ordered field $\mathbb{F}$ with Archimedean property, such that $-1 < 0$ and $(-1)^2 = 1 > 0$, the constraints (i) $x > 0$ and (ii) $x \geq 0$ can be implemented by two equation constraints in three independent variables as follows: (i') $x - y^2 = 0$ and $yz - 1 = 0$, and (ii') $x - y^2 = 0$, respectively. Then, a system of polynomial equations over any field can be solved by classical methods of [12, 14], and the Gröbner basis methods can be applied to the resulting system of simultaneous multivariate polynomial equations.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Security Analysis

The classical analysis of multivariate simultaneous equations can be applied only to polynomial equations [12, 14, 34, 35, 36, 47], and the Gröbner basis analysis [8, 16, 17] cannot be extended to mappings involving functions as exponents. For a security that is immune to threats from Gröbner basis analysis, parametric injective mappings from G^μ into E^ν, with κ parameters, for $\mathsf{G} = \mathbb{F}^*$, $\mathsf{E} = \mathbb{F}$ and $\mu, \nu, \kappa \in \mathbb{N}$, where $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu$ and $\mathbb{F}$ is a finite field, with component mappings taken as expressions from $\mathcal{EXP}\big(\mathbb{F}; [x_1, \ldots, x_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa]\big)$, restricting values of x_i and

ω_j to $\mathbb{F}^*$, for $1 \leq i \leq \mu$ and $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$, with one level of exponentiation as described in section 1.5, are adequate.

The relevance of the complexity analysis described in section 4.3 is as follows: let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_\mu)$, $\omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_\nu)$. For public key cryptography, the problem of computing $\mathbf{x}$ from the equations $P_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = y_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \nu$, with parameters $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa$, requires computation of nonparametric left inverse for $(x_1, \ldots, x_\mu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa) \in \mathbb{F}^{\mu+\kappa}$. For digital signature, the problem of computing $\mathbf{y}$ from the equations $P_i(\mathbf{y}) = x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \mu$, $y_i = x_{\mu+i}$, where $S_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = x_{\mu+i}$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, with parameters $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa$, requires computation of nonparametric right inverse for $(x_1, \ldots, x_\mu, x_{\mu+1}, \ldots, x_\nu, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_\kappa) \in \mathbb{F}^{\nu+\kappa}$, constrained by $S_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = x_{\mu+i}$, $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$. It can be observed that, for digital signature, ω could be under control of a trusted authentication verifier (TAV), which ensures existential unforgeability.

5.2 Summary

In this paper, a new public key data encryption method is proposed, where the plain and encrypted messages are arrays. The method can also be used for digital certificate or digital signature applications. The key generation algorithm is particularly simple, easy and fast, facilitating changes of keys as frequently as required, and fast algorithms for polynomial multiplication and modular arithmetic [7, 40], whenever appropriate, can be adapted in the encryption and decryption algorithms.

References

[1] María T. Acosta-de-Orozco, and Javier Gómez-Calderón, "The Factorization of the Derivative of Dickson Polynomials", *Extracta Mathematicae*, Vol. 6(1), 1991, pp. 42–43

[2] A. Akbary, S. Alaric, and Q. Wang, "On Some Classes of Permutation Polynomials", *International Journal of Number Theory*, Vol. 4(1), 2008, pp. 121–133

[3] A. Akbary, D. Ghioca, and Q. Wang, "On Permutation Polynomials of Prescribed Shape", *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, Vol. 15, 2009, pp. 195–206

[4] A. Akbary, and Q. Wang, "On Some Permutation Polynomials over Finite Fields", *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, Vol. 16, 2005, pp. 2631–2640

[5] Olivier Billet and Jintai Ding, "Overview of Cryptanalysis Techniques in Multivariate Public Key Cryptography", in *Gröbner Bases, Coding, and Cryptography*, M. Sala, T. Mora, L. Perret, S. Sakata, and C. Traverso (Eds.), Part 1, 2009, pp. 263–283

[6] D. J. Bernstein, J. Buchmann, and E. Dahmen, "Post-Quantum Cryptography", Springer-Verlag, 2009

[7] Richard P. Brent, and Paul Zimmermann, "Modern Computer Arithmetic", Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics (No. 18) Cambridge University Press, 2010

[8] Bruno Buchberger, "An Algorithm for Finding the Basis Elements of the Residue Class Ring of a Zero Dimensional Polynomial Ideal", Ph. D. Thesis, University of Innsbruck (1965), English translation by M. Abramson in *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, Special Issue on Logic, Mathematics, and Computer Science: Interactions, Vol. 41(3), 2006, pp. 475–511

[9] Johannes Buchmann, "Introduction to Cryptography", Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2004

[10] D. Castro, M. Giusti, J. Heintz, G. Matera, and L. M. Pardo, "The Hardness of Polynomial Equation Solving", *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, Vol. 3(4), 2003, pp. 347–420

[11] D. Coppersmith, and A. Shamir, "Lattice attacks on NTRU", *Advances in Cryptology -Eurocrypt '97*, LNCS Vol. 1233, Springer Verlag, 1997, pp. 52–61

[12] D. van Dalen, "Logic and Structure", Springer-Verlag, 1994

[13] L. E. Dickson, "The Analytic Representation of Substitutions on a Power of a Prime Number of Letters with a Discussion of the Linear Group", *The Annals of Mathematics*, Vol. 11(1), 1896, pp. 65–120 and 161–183

[14] L. van den Dries, "Classical Model Theory of Fields", in *Model Theory, Algebra and Geometry*, MSRI Publications, Vol. 39, 2000, pp. 37–52

[15] T. ElGamal , "A Public Key Cryptosystem and a Signature Scheme Based on Discrete Logarithms", *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto' 84*, LNCS Vol. 196, Springer-Verlag, 1985, pp. 10–18; Journal version in *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, Vol. 31(4), 1985, pp. 469–472

[16] J.-C. Faugère, "A New Efficient Algorithm for Computing Gröbner Bases (F4)", *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, Vol. 139(1), 1999, pp. 61–88

[17] J.-C. Faugère, "A New Efficient Algorithm for Computing Gröbner Bases without Reduction to Zero (F5)", *Proc. International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ACM Press, 2002, pp. 75–83

[18] S. H. Gao, and G. L. Mullen, "Dickson Polynomials and Irreducible Polynomials over Finite Fields", *Journal of Number Theory*, Vol. 49(1), 1994, pp. 118–132

[19] C. Gentry, "Key Recovery and Message Attacks on NTRU-Composite", *Advances in Cryptology - Eurocrypt 2001*, LNCS Vol. 2045, Springer-Verlag, 2001, pp. 182 - 194

[20] W. Hodges, "Model Theory", Cambridge University Press, 1993

[21] J. Hoffstein, D. Lieman, and J. H. Silverman, "Polynomial Rings and Efficient Public Key Authentication", *Proc. International Workshop on Cryptographic Techniques and E-Commerce (CrypTEC '99)*, Ed. M. Blum and C.H. Lee, City University of Hong Kong Press, 1999

[22] J. Hoffstein, J. Pipher, and J. H. Silverman, "NTRU: A Ring Based Public Key Cryptosystem", *Algorithmic Number Theory (ANTS III)*, LNCS Vol. 1423, Springer-Verlag, 1998, pp. 267–288

[23] J. Hoffstein, J. Pipher, and J. Silverman, "NSS: An NTRU Lattice-based Signature Scheme", *Advances in Cryptology - Eurocrypt 2001*, LNCS Vol. 2045, Springer-Verlag, 2001, pp. 211–228

[24] J. Hoffstein, and J. Silverman, "Polynomial Rings and Efficient Public Key Authentication II", *Proc. Conference on Cryptography and Computational Number Theory (CCNT '99)*, Birkhäuser, 2001, pp. 269–286

[25] J. E. Hopcroft, R. Motwani, and J. D. Ullman, "Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages and Computation", Pearson Education, 2007

[26] E. Horowitz, S. Sahni, and S. Rajasekaran, "Fundamentals of Computer Algorithms", Universities Press, 2007

[27] N. Koblitz, "Elliptic Curve Cryptosystems", *Mathematics of Computation*, Vol. 48(177), 1987, pp. 203–209

[28] N. Koblitz, "A Course in Number Theory and Cryptography", Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, 1994

[29] N. Koblitz, "Algebraic Aspects of Cryptography", *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*, Vol. 3, Second Printing, Springer-Verlag, 1994

[30] Serge Lang, "Algebra", Springer-Verlag, 2002 (previously published by Addison-Wesley, 1993)

[31] R. Lidl, G. L. Mullen, and G. Turnwald, "Dickson Polynomials", Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure & Applied Mathematics, 65, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1993

[32] R. Lidl, and H. Niederreiter, "Introduction to Finite Fields and Their Applications", Cambridge University Press, 1986

[33] C. H. Lin, C. C. Chang, and R. C. T. Lee, "A New Public Key Cipher System Based upon Diophantine Equations", *IEEE Trans. Computers*, Vol. 44(1), 1995, pp. 13–19

[34] Yu. I. Manin, "A Course in Mathematical Logic for Mathematicians", Second Edition, Translated from Russian by N. Koblitz, Springer-Verlag, 2010

[35] D. Marker, "Introduction to Model Theory", in *Model Theory, Algebra and Geometry*, MSRI Publications, Vol. 39, 2000, pp. 15–35

[36] D. Marker, M. Messmer, and A. Pillay, "Model Theory of Fields", Lecture Notes in Logic, Vol. 5, Springer-Verlag, 1996

[37] V. S. Miller, "Use of Elliptic Curves in Cryptography", *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto' 85*, LNCS Vol. 218, Springer-Verlag, 1986, pp. 417–426

[38] G. L. Mullen, "Dickson Polynomials", *Encyclopedia of Mathematics, Supplement II*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000, pp. 154–156

[39] G. L. Mullen, and H. Niederreiter, "Dickson Polynomials over Finite Fields and Complete Mappings", *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, Vol. 30(1), 1987, pp. 19–27

[40] V. Pan, "Complexity of Computations with Matrices and Polynomials", *SIAM Review*, Vol. 34(2), 1992, pp. 225-262

[41] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman, "A Method for Obtaining Digital Signatures and Public-Key Cryptosystems", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 21(2), 1978, pp. 120–126

[42] B. Schneier, "Applied Cryptography", John Wiley & Sons, 1996

[43] N. P. Smart, "The Discrete Logarithm Problem on Elliptic Curves of Trace One", *Journal of Cryptology*, Vol. 12(3), 1999, pp. 193–196

[44] W. Stallings, "Cryptography and Network Security: Principles and Practice", Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall, 2011

[45] W. Stallings, "Network Security Essentials", Fourth Edition, Prentice Hall, 2011

[46] D. R. Stinson, "Cryptography: Theory and Practice", Chapman & Hall Press, 2005

[47] A. Tarski, "A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry", University of California Press, 1951

[48] L. C. Washington, "Elliptic Curves: Number Theory and Cryptography", Chapman & Hall Press, London, 2008